

REMARKS

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0079028 to Kortum in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,381,637 to Kamada and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,423,892 to Ramaswamy. Claims 6-11 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kortum in view of Kamada and Ramaswamy and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,999,754 to Hashimoto. Claims 12-20 were rejected as being unpatentable over Kortum in view of Kamada, Ramaswamy, Hashimoto and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0128768 to Nakano. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

A. Independent Claim 21

New independent claim 21 recites “wherein the terminal controller is configured to monitor for predetermined vehicle events associated with a vehicle on which the vehicle mounted terminal is mounted that impact the connection status of one or more server, and when a predetermined vehicle event is detected, the terminal controller directs the connection status checking unit to recheck the connection status of each server, and if the connection status of a server previously accessible via the vehicle mounted terminal has changed to being inaccessible, the terminal controller updates the menu screen to reflect that the previously accessible server is currently inaccessible via the vehicle mounted terminal such that user selection of a corresponding piece of link information can be avoided.”

The portions of Kortum, Kamada, and Ramaswamy cited do not disclose vehicle terminal controllers or monitoring for vehicle events.

Nakano relates to a route guide information distributing system. (Title.) Nakano discloses “[t]he center station 2 searches for a route based on the received message, and transmits route guide information including a recommended route. On the recommended route, points where the direction of travel is changed more than a predetermined angle or points where the name of the road is changed are set as guide points.” (Abstract; Figure 5.) However, the portions of Nakano cited do not disclose a menu displaying link information associated with different servers. The portions of Nakano cited also do not disclose monitoring predetermined vehicle events that impact the connection status of servers, and then rechecking the connection status of each server when an event occurs.

Hashimoto relates to a car mounted information device. (Title.) However, Hashimoto discloses “end-to-end communication by using electronic mail among vehicles.” (Abstract.) The purpose of Hashimoto is to facilitate “simple end-to-end communication among the vehicles without the communication center.” (Col. 10, ll. 36-38.) Like Nakano, the portions of Hashimoto cited do not disclose monitoring predetermined vehicle events that impact the connection status of servers, and then rechecking the connection status of each server when an event occurs.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that new claim 21 is allowable. Claims 22-26 depend upon independent claim 21 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons stated above.

B. Independent Claim 7

Independent claim 7 as amended recites “a terminal controller configured to monitor for a plurality of predetermined vehicle conditions of the vehicle on which the vehicle mounted terminal is mounted, wherein when the terminal controller determines that one of the plurality of

predetermined vehicle conditions has been satisfied, the terminal controller directs the connection status checking unit to recheck the connection status of each of the linked servers and the menu screen display processing unit to then display the up-to-date connection status of each of the linked servers such that user selection of a linked server that has become inaccessible due to a change in at least one of the plurality of predetermined vehicle conditions can be avoided.”

For at least the same reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 7 has been overcome. Claims 8-17 depend on independent claim 7 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

C. Independent Claim 18

Independent claim 18 as amended recites “monitoring for predetermined vehicle conditions of the vehicle on which the vehicle mounted terminal is mounted; rechecking the connection status of each linked server when a predetermined vehicle condition has been detected; and updating the menu screen on the vehicle mounted terminal to display only pieces of link information that are associated with linked servers that are currently accessible via the vehicle mounted terminal based upon rechecking the connection status of each linked server in response to the predetermined vehicle condition being detected such that user selection of a linked server that is currently inaccessible from the vehicle mounted terminal can be avoided.”

For at least the same reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claim 18 has been overcome. Claims 19-20 depend on independent claim 18 and should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

SUMMARY

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and seeks allowance thereof. If for any reason the Examiner is unable to allow the Application but believes that an interview would be helpful to resolve any issues, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned at (312) 321-4277.

Respectfully submitted,

/Timothy J. Le Duc/

Timothy J. Le Duc
Registration No. 54,745
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200

Dated: April 13, 2009